



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and he ordained over again, as deposed from their orders, all whom he (Formosus) had ordained.*

That all this really was done by Pope Stephen VI. to the dead body of his predecessor, Pope Formosus, is past all reasonable doubt; for it is not only related by Luitprand who wrote so soon after Stephen's time, but we have another account written by Auxilius, who was himself ordained a priest by Pope Formosus,† who relates exactly the same story, except that he says that Pope Stephen only cut off two fingers of the right hand; in all which, he says, Pope Stephen acted like a wild beast, unmindful of humanity; and he observes that the Lord did not say, whatever you shall bind under the earth or under the river, shall be bound in heaven!—Book ii. ch. 30.

The object of cutting off the dead Pope's fingers is not very clear to us. Why did not the live Pope cut off the dead Pope's head?‡ Why not the toe which all the world had been kissing? Why did he not, at least, cut off all his fingers while he was about it? Was it from moderation? or was there any special reason for it? Some say that these three fingers were used in benediction and ordination; in which case, cutting them off would, of course, disable the dead Pope from ordaining any more; but could scarcely be supposed to affect what he had done while living. But, then, it seems strange that Auxilius, who was himself ordained by Formosus, should speak of only two fingers. If but one had been cut, we might have thought it was done to get off "the fisherman's ring;" and, indeed, the Roman Council under Pope John IX., which condemned the acts of Stephen, expressly says that plunder was the object of the whole proceeding.§

We must return to the account in Labbe and Cossart, who proceed thus with Luitprand's story—"Of how great authority and how religious Pope Formosus was, we can gather from this, since, when he was afterwards found by fishermen and carried to the Church of the blessed Prince of the Apostles, certain images of the saints, with veneration, saluted him, placed in his coffin; for this I have very often heard from most religious men of the city of Rome."||

We should have thought that this miracle would have settled the question, whether the ordinations performed by Pope Formosus were to be considered null, and to be repeated; but we shall see presently that the question continued to rage for seventeen years after, and that different Popes decided it in opposite ways. But to return again to the life of Pope Stephen VI.; it goes on to say—"Pope Stephen added crime to crime, when in a synod which he collected, he approved the nefarious, impious, and detestable act. For the stones themselves, execrating such a monstrosity, then cried out with their own voice by knocking against each other, that they would more willingly suffer spontaneous ruin, than that the Roman Church should remain depressed by so great a scandal. It happened, then, that the sacred Basilica of the Lateran, the principal seat of the Pope, fell prostrate from the altar to the door, an evil angel striking it, because the walls were by no means able to stand, when the first rock of the hinge was shaken by the earthquake of so great a crime."¶

The life in Labbe and Cossart goes on to say, that "the heretics of our time (the Protestants) on account of that impious act, wickedly rise up against the promises of Christ made to Peter and the Church, and boasting too much of victory, triumph too soon."** We give now the defence of these most learned men against the triumph of the Protestants, and let us see if it be satisfactory: "For all things, which Stephen said or did against Formosus, he did as a man struck with madness, fulfilling what his raging fury suggested. But he defined nothing against faith or good morals by pontifical authority lawfully obtained. For the bishops and presbyters who were summoned to a synod about this matter, being not unlike to Stephen, persecuted Formosus with like hatred, and, therefore, pronounced for

that sentence which they knew would be agreeable to a man struck with madness. From whence we acknowledge, indeed, a violent tyranny in fact in this matter; but we confidently deny that an error in faith was defined or approved by Stephen lawfully obtaining pontifical authority; although it would in no way prejudice the apostolic See, if we should grant that an usurper, not lawfully elected, but an intrusive false Pope had erred in affirming articles of faith.**

The force of the defence lies in this—first, that Stephen VI. was a madman, and not lawfully Pope; and, secondly, that he defined nothing against faith or good morals.

As to the first, it is a common and an easy device, when a Pope is convicted of infamous crimes, or sacrilege, or error in faith, to say, "Oh, that man was no lawful Pope; he got the Popedom by tyranny or bribery, or even by worse means, and, of course, the powers of a true and lawful Pope are not to be expected in him." We shall have many instances to show, in which Roman Catholics are driven to set up this defence and excuse for the doings of their Popes.

But is not this the great argument in support of the claims of the Popes—"that it is impossible to believe that God would have left his Church without a visible head, a living and speaking judge, in the place of Christ, whom all might safely follow in the confidence of faith?" And is it not still harder to believe that God should profess and undertake to give his Church such a head and judge, and yet leave the Church liable to be deceived by a false head—to be imposed on by a madman, who was no lawful Pope, and led by him into wholesale sacrilege about the so-called sacrament of orders? If the Church cannot distinguish between a true and a false head, where is her security in having a visible head?

Now, this very account of Pope Stephen in Labbe and Cossart, which sets up this defence, that Stephen was no lawful Pope, does also say (as we have shown above) that "the whole clergy approved of him, and the whole Catholic Church acknowledged him as the Vicar of Christ and the successor of Peter;" and the account concludes by saying, "after he had held the apostolic See six years, being strangled in prison, he closed his life by an infamous death, God being the avenger."† Was not this a great security to the Catholic Church, to be for six years looking up to a sacrilegious madman, who actually filled the place of the Pope, but who was no lawful Pope—mistaking him for the Vicar of Christ and true head of the Church?

This is what Roman Catholics tell us themselves. And then they ask us how we can dare to suppose that God would leave his Church without a visible head, a living and speaking judge in the place of Christ?

And to this we reply, that if God had undertaken to provide such a head, He would not have let it become a delusion and a snare, such as we have it proved by Roman Catholic authority that this Pope Stephen was.

But how do Labbe and Cossart know that this Stephen was not a lawful Pope? The whole Catholic Church thought that he was—nay, Pope John IX., who succeeded soon after, and whom all Roman Catholics acknowledge as a lawful Pope, thought so too; for he held a council at Rome in the year 904, to reverse the proceedings of Pope Stephen and his council against Formosus; and that council of Pope John commences thus—"We wholly repeal the council celebrated in the time of Pope Stephen VI., OF PIUS MEMORY—to wit, OUR PREDECESSOR—in which the venerable body of the venerable Pope Formosus was dragged through the land from its violated sepulchre, . . ."

Clearly, then, the Church at that time, even when it had a Pope whom Roman Catholics now think was a lawful head, did not find out its mistake about Pope Stephen; for the lawful successor, even when repealing Pope Stephen's acts, acknowledged him as a lawful Pope.

To say he was not a lawful Pope is a mere afterthought to get out of a difficulty, and one which Roman Catholics of the present day are not agreed about; for Bishop Milner, in his *End of Controversy* (Letter xxviii., century ix.), thus gives the list of the Popes—" . . . John VIII., Marinus, Adrian III., Stephen VI., Formosus, Stephen VII., Romanus, Theodore II., John IX., Benedict IV., Leo V., Christopher, and Sergius III."

The second point in the defence of Labbe and Cossart against "the heretics," is that Pope Stephen VI. defined nothing contrary to faith or good morals. It is confessed by Labbe and Cossart themselves, that Pope Stephen VI. did commit sacrilege in decreeing that persons who had

been lawfully ordained should be ordained over again; and, we ask, is not sacrilege, at least, contrary to good morals? But was not this sacrilege also contrary to the Roman faith as now held? This is certainly a hard thing to urge against Roman Catholics; because their religion, being formed, from time to time, by additions and inventions of men, is not the same in one age which it becomes in another; and it is hard to expect Popes of the 9th century to decide according to what their religion was to be in the 19th. But while Roman Catholics continue to assert that their religion has been the same in all ages, we must continue to show them the falsehood of this assertion.

It is confessed that Pope Stephen did decree that all who had been ordained by his predecessor, Pope Formosus, should be ordained over again. The Council of Trent declared that three of the sacraments of the Roman Church, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, cannot be repeated.* It has ever since been held that it is sacrilege, and contrary to the true Roman faith about the sacraments, to ordain over again those who have once been ordained. But all now acknowledge that those whom Formosus ordained were really ordained; yet Pope Stephen and his council decreed that they should be ordained over again, contrary to the Roman doctrine, as now held about the sacraments. And Auxilius, who was ordained by Formosus, tells us (Book ii. c. 9) that "a great multitude of bishops, priests, and deacons" were so ordained over again. Pope Stephen VI. did, therefore, err in the Roman faith concerning the sacrament of orders; and he led "the whole Catholic Church," who followed him "as the vicar of Christ," into wholesale sacrilege about "the sacrament of orders;" and it was, indeed, a question of faith, that the live Pope and the dead Pope were then cutting off each other's fingers about. And yet we feel that it is rather hard to urge this against Pope Stephen VI., when we consider what has been said about this very case by Father Morinus, the most learned authority of the Church of Rome in the matter of ordination—"It had not yet passed into a thing settled, and AN AXIOM OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH, that whatever ordination performed according to the rites of the Church, and by a bishop ordained according to those rites, was valid, and in no case to be repeated."† So this poor madman, Pope Stephen VI., only erred in not knowing what "the axioms of the Catholic faith" might turn out to be 600 years after! If he was a Pope, he was, at least, no prophet! It is hard to blame him; but we commend this to the consideration of those modern Roman Catholics who still think that "the axioms of the Catholic faith," have been the same in the Church of Rome in all ages. Clearly it was not so about "the sacrament of orders."

One word now about the history of this question about the ordinations of Pope Formosus.

About the year 896, Pope Stephen VI., and his council at Rome, ordered all those ordained by Formosus, to be ordained over again.

In the year 904, Pope John IX., and his council at Rome, repealed all that Pope Stephen and his council had decreed. Benedict IV., Leo V., and Christophorus kept this decree unchanged.‡

About the year 906, Pope Sergius III. renewed the decree that the ordinations of Pope Formosus were to be repeated.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., p. 517.

How long this decree of Pope Sergius III. held good we cannot tell. The following Popes seem too deeply sunk in wickedness to trouble their heads about ordinations. But Morinus says, "this controversy afflicted the Church about seventeen years."—Part iii., cap. 3., p. 69. And that, although Luitprand says, that at the very beginning of the controversy the images of the saints interfered to try and settle it, by bowing down to Pope Formosus in his coffin!

We commend it to Roman Catholics to consider, "where was the head of the Church, and the living and speaking judge in place of Christ, during the pontificate of Pope Stephen VI.?" Even if this were a solitary instance, it is yet enough to disprove the notion that God must always have given such a head to the Church. But we warn them it is not a solitary instance.

We purpose proceeding with the history of the Popes in our next number, and we fear the result will still further horrify those who still try to believe that the Papacy was instituted by God, and that the Pope is the inheritor of the promises made to the Church.

THE SUCCESSION OF ST. PATRICK.

In our number for last August, we published an article "ON THE SUCCESSION OF THE IRISH BISHOPS." At the end of that article we said, "whether Roman Catholics can show a clear succession in the Archbishopric of Armagh, the See of St. Patrick, we will put to the proof in our next number. We will give the succession of the archbishops of Armagh down from Primate Cromer, who was Archbishop of Armagh in 1530, before the Reformation. We now call on all Roman Catholic archbishops in Ireland

* Session vii., canon 9.

† Nondum enim in rem judicatam transierat, et in fidei Catholica axioma, quamlibet ordinationem secundum ecclesie ritum ab episcopo secundum eundem ritum ordinato celebratam, validam esse, et nullo casu iterandam.—Morinus de Sacris ordinationibus, part ii., p. 283. Antwerp, 1695.

‡ Platina says that Pope Romanus, also, abrogated the acts of Stephen; and Pope Theodore II. restored the acts of Formosus.—Ut Supra, p. 114.

* Quo constituto, ut impius, doctrinarumque sanctarum insecus, Formosus a sepulchro extrahitur, atque in sede pontificatus sacerdotibus vestimentis indutus collocari precepit, cui ait: "Cum Portuensis esset episcopus, cur ambitionis spiritus Romanam universalem sedem usurpasti?" His expletis, sacris exutus vestimentis, digittisque tribus abscissis, in Tiberim jactari precepit, cunctosque quos ipse ordinaverat, gradu proprio depositos, iterum ordinavit.

† The two books of Auxilius in defence of the ordinations of Pope Formosus are printed in Morinus de Sac. Ordin., part ii., p. 285. Antwerp, 1695. Few works of that age are written with so much learning and good sense as these of Auxilius.

** If Platina, who was keeper of the Vatican Library, under Pope Sixtus IV., is to be believed, Pope Sergius III., who a second time annulled the acts of Pope Formosus, had his body also a second time exhumed, and actually did cut off his head, and threw his body again into the Tiber!—See Platina De Vitis Pontificum, p. 116, Ed. optima, 1629.

‡ Sub fœdera conspirationis ad capiendum Thesaurum, corpus illius trahentes, &c.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., p. 505. Can. 9. Ed. Paris, 1671.

¶ Quante autem auctoritatis, quantæque religionis Papa Formosus fuerit, hinc colligere possumus, quoniam dum a piscatoribus postmodum esset inventus, atque ad beati apostolorum principis ecclesiam deportatus, sanctorum quædam imagines hunc in loco positum venerabiliter salutantur. Hoc namque a religiosissimis Romanæ urbis viris persæpe audit.

¶ Addidit culpam culpæ Stephanus Papa, quando collecta synodo, nefarium, impium, et detestandum facinus approbavit. Ipsi enim lapides tale portentum execrati, sua tunc voce mutua collisione clamant, spontaneam libentibus pati ruinam, quam ut Romana ecclesia tanto scandalo depressa maneret. Accidit tunc ut sacrosancta Basilica Lateranensis, primaria pontificis sedes, impulso angelo malo, ab altari usque ad portas prostrata corruerit, quia nequaquam stare poterant parietes, dum prima cardinis petra tanti facinus terræ motu concussa fuisset.

¶ Hæretici nostri temporis . . . contra promissiones Christi Petro et ecclesie factas, propter illud factum impium male insurgunt et præmature nimis de victoria gloriantur triumphum agunt.

* Omnia enim quæ Stephanus contra Formosum dixit vel egit, homo furor percipit egit, implens id quod exæstans rabies ausit. Pontificia vero auctoritas legitime usurpata nihil contra adum vel bonos mores definitur. Nam qui hac de causa ad synodum convocati sunt episcopi et presbyteri Stephanum non dissimiles, simili odio Formosum præsquebantur, adeoque in eandem sententiam pronuntiabant, quam homini furor percipit gratam fore præseebant. Unde hac in re violentam quidem tyrannidem in facto accusamus, errorem autem in fide per Stephanum pontificem auctoritatem legitime usurpantem definitum vel approbatum fuisse constanter pernegamus; quamquam nihil sedi apostolicæ præjudicaretur, si dæremus invasorem non legitime electum, sed intrusum pseudopontificem in articulis fidei asserendis aberrasse.

† Postquam sedem apostolicam sex annis tenuisset, in eodem carcere strangulatus, Deo vindice, exitu infami vitam clausit.

‡ Synodum tempore piæ recordationis sexti Stephani papæ, decessoris videlicet nostri celebratam, in quam venerabile corpus Formosi venerandi papæ, de sepultura violata per terram tractum est, . . . penitus abdicamus.—Labbe and Coss., vol. ix., p. 502.

§ This is the same Stephen, called Stephen VI. by Labbe and Cossart, as observed in a foregoing note; another proof, as we there remarked, that the Roman Church has no certain means of saying of any particular Pope, whether he be a true head of the Church or not.

(especially Dr. Dixon), on all Roman Catholic bishops, priests, and laymen, to send us a list of Roman Catholic archbishops in succession from Primate Cromer, with the dates of the vacancies and appointments, and the proofs of each. If any such list should be sent to us, we will publish it, side by side, with our own list; if no such list should be sent to us, Roman Catholics may well suspect that it is as great a puzzle to make out a Roman Catholic succession in Armagh, as in Dublin. We have now put this question in a position in which it may be fairly examined and discussed; and we trust our readers will look with interest for the result.

We now appeal to our Roman Catholic readers, whether that proposal was not a fair one on our part—whether it would not have been the most satisfactory way to have the two successions placed side by side, that they might be examined and compared together?

We greatly regret that it is not in our power now to place the two successions side by side; but the fact is, that no Roman Catholic has ventured to send us a list of the succession of their archbishops in the chair of St. Patrick; and that, although we have waited a second month for it.

We are not surprised—for it is our conviction that no Roman Catholic can give us such a list as would stand examination. But we think such a fact must be either humiliating or instructive to Roman Catholics, who have been so long accustomed to hear their priests and bishops boasting of their succession from St. Patrick. We wish this fact to be instructive to them, and not humiliating; for no man is really humbled by learning an important fact, but the contrary. We, therefore, call again on all candid Roman Catholics to inquire of their priests, whether a list of their archbishops of Armagh can be given, showing their succession from St. Patrick, or from Primate Cromer, who was Archbishop of Armagh before the Reformation.

In the meantime, all we can do is to give what we believe to be the true succession of Archbishops of Armagh, from Primate Cromer, which we take from Sir James Ware's learned work on the Irish bishops.* It will then be for Roman Catholics, if they can, to give us what they consider the true succession.

Names.	When each succeeded.	When each died, or otherwise vacated.
George Cromer	A.D. 1522.	Died, 1543.
George Dowdall	1543	Abandoned the see, October, 1551.
Hugh Goodacre	Feb., 1553.	Died, May, 1553.
George Dowdall	Restored Mar. 1554.	} Died, August, 1558
Adam Loftus	March, 1563.	
Thomas Lancaster	June, 1564.	Died, 1584.
John Long	July, 1584.	Died, 1589.
John Garvey	May, 1589.	Died, March, 1595.
Henry Usher	August, 1595.	Died, April, 1613.
Christopher Hampton	May, 1613.	Died, January, 1625.
James Usher	March, 1625.	March, 1656.
John Bramhall	January, 1661.	June, 1663.
James Marqueton	August, 1663.	August, 1674.
Michael Boyle	January, 1679.	December, 1702.
Narcissus Marsh	Feb., 1703.	November, 1713.
Thomas Lindsay	May, 1714.	July, 1724.
Hugh Boulter	1724.	Died, Sept., 1742.
John Hoadly	1742.	Died, July, 1746.
George Stone	1747.	Died, Dec., 1764.
Richard Robinson	1765.	Died, October, 1794.
William Newcome	1795.	Died January, 1800.
William Stuart	1800.	Died, 1822.
Lord John G. Beresford.	1822.	

Now, if Roman Catholics can do for themselves what we have done here, let them do so; and we will be ready to publish their list, and to compare the two successions; but if they cannot venture to do it, will they attempt hereafter to boast of their succession from St. Patrick?

We shall proceed to give the succession in the See of Dublin next.

TALK OF THE ROAD.—No. XXV.

"PAT, I have got something new to talk about," said Jem, pulling a roll of paper out of his pocket.

"Let us see it, Jem," said Pat. So Jem unrolled the paper, and showed a beautiful picture, with fine, bright colours in it.

So said Pat, "what is it at all, Jem?"

"Don't you see for yourself Pat?" said Jem.

"Why, then, if it isn't the souls in Purgatory!" said Pat.

"Deed and it isn't then; you're out for this time," said Jem; "so look again, Pat."

So Pat looked again; "and what else can you make of it at all?" said Pat.

"The bodies in purgatory," said Jem.

"Well, sure enough, it is," said Pat; "sure enough them's bodies; them can't be souls anyway. But isn't it mostly souls that goes to Purgatory?" said Pat, a little puzzled.

"Well, I never heard tell of any but souls going there, if so be they go there at all," said Jem; "but you see yourself it's bodies that is in it."

"Sure enough it is, Jem," said Pat; "and my! but they're the purty creatures, them women, just like real

ladies! I wonder what they done at all to bring them there? Would they be bad women, now?" said Pat.

"Well, you know Pat," said Jem, "that couldn't be; for doesn't the catechism say that them that dies in mortal sin goes to hell for all eternity, and not to Purgatory?"

"Aye," said Pat; "but doesn't the catechism say, too, that them that gets their mortal sin, and the guilt of it, forgiven in this world, has still to go to Purgatory, for a time, to get the stains washed out of them before they can go to heaven, where nothing defiled can enter? and mightn't it be that way they got there?"

"Well, maybe so," said Jem, "if so be that them that's forgiven goes there at all. But when Jesus Christ said to the woman that was a sinner, *thy sins are forgiven thee*; and when he allowed her to wash his feet with her tears, and wipe them with the hair of her head, and, more than all, when he finished with her by saying, *thy faith hath saved thee*, GO IN PEACE, did he just mean to bid her go to Purgatory? or was that the meaning she took out of it?"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "I'm thinking if Jesus Christ had just took and shown her that picture, she wouldn't have gone in peace anyway."

"I'm thinking so, too," said Jem; "and that when the Blessed Lord said them blessed words to the woman that was a sinner, he didn't mean the picture at all; and it's hard to think that them that's forgiven by him will ever come to the like of what's in that picture."

"Well, if they was ever so bad," said Pat, "sure it would be only commonly decent, with their purty, white skins, and the beautiful hair flowing down on their backs, to put a bit of a shift on them itself when their pictures was going to be took in Purgatory."

"Man alive," said Jem, "what good would that be? sure look at the long flames just curling up all round them, and wouldn't the shift be burned off them afore you could look round?"

"Well, I don't know for that," said Pat; "sure there isn't so much as the sign of a sear on their beautiful skins; and why couldn't the shift stand it as well? Don't you mind in the Book of Daniel, when the wicked king put the three men in the fire, because they would not worship the golden image, the fire couldn't hurt their clothes no more than themselves."†

"Well, sure enough," said Jem, "the picture looks a deal more like people that the fire couldn't hurt at all, than like people it could hurt; and that being the way, they might as well have their clothes on, and I'm thinking it might be better too in the picture; for you know yourself, Pat, there's many a young boy that cares little for Purgatory, that would buy that picture just for the bad thoughts that could be took out of it."

"Well, there's some in the picture dressed fine enough, anyway," said Pat; "who would they be now?"

"Sure them's the angels taking the souls out of Purgatory," said Jem; "don't you see the wings on them?"

"Well, that's the elegant dress on that angel," said Pat; "that's the beautiful green bedgown, and the purtiest red petticoat ever I seen. Sure the finest lass at a fair would be proud to be an angel, to wear such a bedgown and petticoat!"

"Deed and she might," said Jem; "but sure a girl that wore the like of that would, at least, have the shoes on her arm going to a fair or a market."

"But what's this, at all, at the top," said Pat, "with all the bright light about it? Well, it's the cross and a lamb on it. Won't that be Jesus, now?"

"That's what it's meant for," said Jem; "the lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world;† and don't you see the blood running from its throat, and the angels catching the blood in golden cups, and pouring it out on the people in Purgatory?"

"And is it the blood of Christ and not the fire, after all, that cleanses them that's in Purgatory?" said Pat; "and is it only waiting in the fire they are till they get the blood of Christ? didn't I think that sins were forgiven in this life by the blood of Christ, and that them that was forgiven had to go to Purgatory to get their stains bleached out of their souls by the fire itself? but if it's the blood of Christ that cleanses too, what is the fire for at all?"

"Well, it's just for to punish them," said Jem.

"Don't tell me of punishment for them that's forgiven," said Pat, "that's not reason, and it's not Gospel. Either the fire is to cleanse out the stains of the soul, after the sins is forgiven, or it's for nothing at all; and which does the cleansing, is it the blood of Christ, or is it the fire?"

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "the Bible tells us of forgiveness of sins, through the blood of Christ; and it tells us just the same of the cleansing too. Sure doesn't it say—'How much more shall the blood of Christ, who by the Holy Ghost offered himself unspotted unto God, cleanse our conscience from dead works, to serve the living God.'‡ And if the blood of Christ does all, what is the fire for?"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "here is the differ of the Bible and the picture. Both allows that the blood of Christ does it; but, by the Bible, the blood of Christ does it now;

* St. Luke, vii. 37, to the end.

† This history is in the fourth chapter of the Book of Daniel. N.B.—Observe, from verse 25 to verse 90 of this chapter, in the Douay Bible, is not in Hebrew Bible—Daniel wrote in Hebrew: neither is it in the Protestant Bible; but the account of the men being saved in the fire is in both Bibles.

‡ Gospel of St. John, i. 29.

§ Hebrews, ix. 14 (Douay Bible).

and, by the picture, the blood of Christ won't cleanse us till we get to Purgatory."

"Well, I think that's it," said Jem. "Sure we have the Bible and the picture to choose between."

"Well, thank God for having the choice anyway," said Pat, "which I wonder would the priests like us to follow?"

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "I got this picture in a shop that had plenty more, just high hand to the great Carmelite Church, in York-row, in Dublin. Sure the priests like to see it set up in the windows; if they don't like it, why don't they stop it? Sure it isn't Protestants sells that! And why don't they say a word against it? Why don't they warn the people against it, the way they do against reading the Bible? Sure the priests like the picture well, and why wouldn't they give it to us for our religion. I'm thinking there is a deal of things in our religion would be better took off it, if any priest would only set about it."

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "I thought that last week, when I seen Peter McKenna buying a horse in Kilcommon fair; and the horse had a big bush of a tail on him, and Peter got him cheap, for he ran him down for falling away entirely in the hind quarters; and when Peter got him into a yard, he just backed him up to the wrong end of a cart, and whipped the big tail off him, and then he stood a one-side, and says Peter—'Now, isn't that a great addition to him entirely.' And thinks I to myself, wouldn't it be a great addition to our religion if it was well docked too."

"Well, never mind the horse, Pat," said Jem. "But sure enough there's a deal to come off our religion, and the more the Bible gets out, the sooner it will be done."

And the more we hear of the talk of plain people, like Pat and Jem, the more hope we have that the Bible will get out indeed.

THE LIFE OF A PRIEST.

To those who are themselves seeking for truth, or desirous of studying the human mind under circumstances, and, perhaps, struggles similar to their own, a truthful narrative of the mental workings of one who has made serious sacrifices to what he is convinced is the cause of truth, may, perhaps, not be without instruction, or, at least, interest. It will be seen, at any rate, in what follows, that the writer has not been actuated by any momentary impulse, or propelled by any ecclesiastical censures, in taking the course he has finally adopted; but has been led to his present views by slow degrees, and, after long deliberation and a diligent study of that Holy Book which all Christians equally acknowledge to be the Word of the Living God.

Guided by such feelings and principles, allow me to introduce myself to your notice, and to that of the educated and thinking persons who read the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, as a priest who passed his classes, with some distinction, in the College of Maynooth, where I remained during the period of six years—the three first of which were spent in exercises on metaphysics, ethics, and mathematics, under the guidance of French refugees (Sorbonnists), whose literary merit I was then unable to appreciate, but who, now that my judgment is matured by years, I have no hesitation in saying, were men of unquestionable talent and varied information. The other three years were misspent in the quibbling casuistry of moral theology.

During all that time the students were not instructed in the Scriptures, except during one hour on Sunday, by the dean, who was an indifferent scholar, and who explained them according to the view of that Church of which he was a paid official, invariably enforcing his arguments by reference to decrees and councils, rather than to the internal evidence of undoubted inspiration.

After my course of education was completed, I was ordained in due course, and obliged, in one hour after, to take up the Breviary, a book replete with the most palpable falsehoods that were ever dictated by the pen of untruth. It will be sufficient for my justification in leaving off reading this book (although taught that I was bound to read it, under pain of mortal sin), to point out one or two of those fables. One day, during the infancy of Peter of Alcantara, and whilst a baby, under a Spanish veranda, a swarm of bees came into the cradle where the baby was placed, got into his armpit, and brought out honey therein! Another of these fables is—The Bishop of Cracow, in Poland, purchased a plot of land from one of the public functionaries, to build a church on. In some time after, the bishop was called upon for payment, to which application he replied, that the money was already paid, and required but three days to substantiate his point. The holy bishop repaired to the cemetery, where his man of business had been buried upwards of three years, took off his mantle, spread it on the tomb, and called upon his old friend to come up, and, in an instant, he came forth, walked to the magistrate's office, deposed, on oath, that the money was paid, went back, and slept in the Lord! I am induced to add another, although at the risk of trespassing on the pages of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN. A friar wanted to cross the Nile, but could not procure a boat. A crocodile, seeing the holy man's distress, backed in to the bank and carried him over in safety! Such are the fables that are to be found in that book, which is put